

1
2
3
4
5
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

8 KHRISTIE REED, on Behalf of
9 Herself and All Others Similarly
Situating,

10 Plaintiff,

11 vs.

12 DYNAMIC PET PRODUCTS; and
FRICK'S MEAT PRODUCTS, INC.,

13 Defendants.

CASE NO. 15-cv-0987-WQH-DHB
ORDER

14 HAYES, Judge:

15 The matter before the Court is a request to stay this case. (ECF No. 89 at 2).

16 Plaintiff Khristie Reed commenced this class action in May 2015. (ECF No. 1).

17 A separate class action was filed in the Circuit Court of Jackson County, Missouri, that
18 "names the same two defendants, alleges similar facts, concerns similar events, and
19 alleges many similar causes of action." (ECF No. 86 at 2). The parties to the Missouri
20 action reached a "global class action settlement [(the "Settlement")]" that, upon court
21 approval, would potentially resolve the claims pending before this Court." *Id.* Reed
22 and other plaintiffs in the Missouri action filed objections to the Settlement. *Id.*

23 In light of these developments in the Missouri case, the parties to this case filed
24 a Joint Motion to Stay this Action. (ECF No. 86). The Joint Motion asked this Court
25 to stay this case until the Missouri Circuit Court ruled on the objections to the
26 Settlement and the Missouri parties decided whether or not to appeal that ruling. *Id.* at
27 2-3. The Court granted the Joint Motion and stayed the case through September 12,
28 2017. (ECF No. 88 at 3).

1 The Missouri Circuit Court issued an order approving the Settlement on August
2 11, 2017, and the objectors (including Reed) appealed that order on September 11,
3 2017. (ECF No. 89 at 2). The parties now “jointly request that the Court issue a further
4 stay of this action until after notice to this Court of a ruling on [the] appeal of the
5 [Missouri Court] settlement, or by ex parte application of either party at any time.”
6 (ECF No. 89 at 2).¹ The Court ordered the parties to “show cause, by October 10, 2017,
7 why this case should not be dismissed without prejudice, with leave for any party to file
8 a motion to reopen the case at any time.” (ECF No. 90). The parties each filed a
9 response to the Order to Show Cause on October 10, 2017. (ECF Nos. 91 and 92).

10 Having reviewed the Joint Status Report (ECF No. 89), the parties’ responses to
11 the Order to Show Cause (ECF Nos. 91 and 92), and the record of this action, the Court
12 concludes that this action should be stayed while the Missouri Court of Appeals reviews
13 the order approving the Settlement.

14 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this action is stayed until this Court receives
15 notice of the Missouri Court of Appeals’ ruling on the appeal of the order approving the
16 Settlement. The parties shall file status reports (1) ninety days from the date of this
17 Order, (2) every ninety days thereafter until the Missouri Court of Appeals issues a
18 ruling on the appeal, and (3) within ten days of the Missouri Court of Appeals’ ruling
19 on the appeal. The Clerk of the Court shall administratively close this action without
20 prejudice to any party and with leave to be reopened by the Court upon notification that
21 the Missouri Court of Appeals ruled on the appeal.

22 DATED: November 3, 2017

23 
24 **WILLIAM Q. HAYES**
25 United States District Judge
26

27 _____
28 ¹ The parties also suggest that another case before this Court, *Brown v. Dynamic
Pet Products, LLC et al.*, 17-cv-0659, “be stayed for the same duration as [this] matter.”
(ECF No. 89 at 3). However, no motion to stay has been filed in that case.